

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

IN RE: ARNOLD D. DUNCHOCK (P13013),

Misc. No. 96-X-72962

Petitioner.

ORDER DENYING APPLICATION FOR REINSTATEMENT

On January 31, 2008, petitioner, Arnold D. Dunchock, was suspended from the practice of law in this Court and in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District of Michigan pursuant to E.D. Mich. L.R. 83.22. On April 01, 2008, petitioner applied for readmission following the termination of his suspension in the practice of law in the State of Michigan. The petition for reinstatement was assigned to the undersigned judges (The Panel), by the order of the Chief Judge on April 10, 2008. The order stated “. . .if [petitioner] is found to be unfit to resume the practice of law, his petition will be dismissed.” Petitioner is unfit to resume the practice of law. Accordingly, his petition is DISMISSED. The reasons follow.

As is customary in a reinstatement matter, the Grievance Administrator of the State of Michigan Attorney Grievance Commission filed a Grievance Administrator’s Investigative Report. This was followed up by a Grievance Administrator’s Supplemental Investigative Report.

The Panel held a hearing on the petition on July 22, 2008, at the conclusion of which it directed the Grievance Administrator to outline his position with respect to the petition for reinstatement. On August 05, 2008, the Grievance Administrator’s Statement in Opposition to Federal Reinstatement was filed. On August 29, 2008, Petitioner’s Response To

Grievance Administrator's Statement In Opposition To Federal Reinstatement was filed.

L.R. 83.22(i) - Reinstatement, provides in part:

(2) The attorney seeking reinstatement must prove by clear and convincing evidence that:

(D) He has the moral qualifications, competency and learning in the law required for admission to practice before the federal court, and that his resumption of the practice of law will not be detrimental to the integrity and standing of the bar or to the administration of justice, or subversive of the public interest.

Based on an analysis of the record and of petitioner's activities as described by the Grievance Administrator in the Statement in Opposition, the Panel finds that petitioner has failed to carry the burden imposed on him under L.R. 83.22(i)(2), and for these reasons the petition for reinstatement has been DISMISSED.*

SO ORDERED.

s/Avern Cohn
AVERN COHN
U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

s/Patrick J. Duggan
PATRICK J. DUGGAN
U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

s/Arthur J. Tarnow
ARTHUR J. TARNOW
U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: September 19, 2008
Detroit, Michigan

* This order is without prejudice to the right of petitioner to apply for reinstatement following one year from the date of this order.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of this notice was served upon Chief Judge Bernard Friedman, Arnold D. Dunchock, Robert L. Agacinski, Grievance Administrator, Rebecca Wilson, Attorney Grievance Commission, Stephen Murphy, U.S. Attorney, and David Weaver, Court Administrator on this date September 19, 2008 by ordinary mail and/or electronic mail.

Date: September 19, 2008

s/ Julie Owens

Deputy Clerk

313-234-5160